



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 09/844,759

Confirmation No.: 2123

Applicant: J. J. Garcia-Luna-Aceves, et al.

Filed: April 26, 2001

Art Unit: 2152

Examiner: Chankong, Dohm

Docket No: 5543P004

Customer No.: 08791

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on July 25, 2005
Date of Deposit

Vineta T. Tubano
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

[Signature]
Signature

07/25/2005
Date

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

AMENDMENTS AND RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION


Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action of March 31, 2005, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to enter the following amendments and consider the following remarks.

Interview Summary begins on Page 2 of this paper.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on Page 3 of this paper

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 6 of this paper.



INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On July 13, 2005, during a teleconference between Examiner Chankong, Dohm, Attorney of Record Tarek N. Fahmi (Registration No. 41,402), Agent of Record Chze Koon, Chua (Registration No. 53,831), Inventor J. J. Garcia-Luna-Aceves and Lillian Withrow, Claim 1 of the present invention was discussed.

In particular, the participants discussed the rejection of Claim 1 in light of McCanne (U.S. Patent No. 6,415,323) and Yamano (U.S. Patent 6,314,088). It was noted that the redirection scheme of Yamano uses only anycast addressing while McCanne uses the method of resolving an anycast address to a unicast address. It is questionable whether a mechanism such as that described by McCanne would ever have been considered for use in combination with the system taught by Yamano.